1	OSEPH P. RUSSONIELLO (CASBN 44332) nited States Attorney		
2 3	BRIAN J. STRETCH (CASBN 163973) Chief, Criminal Division		
4 5 6 7 8 9	CHAD M. MANDELL (ILBN 6286783) Special Assistant United States Attorney 150 Almaden Boulevard San Jose, California 95113 Telephone: (408) 535-5059 Facsimile: (408) 535-5066 Email: chad.mandell@usdoj.gov Attorneys for the United States of America UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
11	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
12	SAN JOSE DIVISION		
13			
14	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,) No. CR 08 00313 JW		
15	Plaintiff, STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED]		
16	v.) ORDER EXCLUDING TIME FROM JUNE 9, 2008 TO JULY 7, 2008 FROM THE JUVENAL LOPEZ-CASTRO,) SPEEDY TRIAL ACT CALCULATION		
17	JUVENAL LOPEZ-CASTRO,) SPEEDY TRIAL ACT CALCULATION (18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(A)) Defendant.)		
18			
19			
20			
21	The parties stipulate that the time between June 7, 2008 to July 7, 2008 is excluded under the		
22	Speedy Trial Act, 18 U.S.C. §3161, and agree that the failure to grant the requested continuance		
23	would unreasonably deny defense counsel reasonable time necessary for effective preparation,		
24	taking into account the exercise of due diligence. Finally, the parties agree that the ends of justice		
25	served by granting the requested continuance outweigh the best interest of the public, and the		
26	defendant in a speedy trial and in the prompt disposition of		
27			
28			

1	criminal cases. 18 U.S.C. §3161(h)(8)(A).	
2		
3	DATED: June 9, 2008	JOSEPH P. RUSSONIELLO United States Attorney
4		Office States Attorney
5		CHAD M. MANDELL
6		Special Assistant United States Attorney
7		
8		LARA VINNARD
9		Attorney for Defendant
10		
11		
12		
13 14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

Case 5:08-cr-00313-JW Document 12 Filed 06/10/2008 Page 2 of 3

1 ORDER

Based upon the stipulation of the parties, and for good cause shown, the Court HEREBY ORDERS that the time between June 9, 2008 to July 7, 2008 is excluded under the Speedy Trial Act, 18 U.S.C. §3161. The court finds that the failure to grant the requested continuance would unreasonably deny defense counsel reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. Furthermore, the Court finds that the ends of justice served by granting the requested continuance outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial and in the prompt disposition of criminal cases. The court therefore concludes that this exclusion of time should be made under 18 U.S.C. §3161(h)(8)(A).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED:

JAMES WARE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE